

removal. In addition to blades and/or abrasion elements, shaving devices can comprise skin flow control elements which control the flow of hair across the shaving device and thereby control the angle at which the blade edges or abrasion elements contact the hair. The shaving devices may comprise one or more blades having a cutting depth of not greater than about 75 microns. The shaving devices are formed on rigid or flexible substrates using one or more of the following techniques: photolithography, wet chemical etching, dry etching, or material deposition techniques.

REMARKS

Claims 1-115 are pending in this application; claims 1-63, 70-84 and 88-115 are withdrawn from consideration, and therefore claims 64-69 and 85-87 remain for consideration.

The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to for not being a single paragraph and for using the implied phrase "the present invention comprises." The Abstract is amended herein in order to be in single paragraph form and to remove the objected to phrase. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure is now overcome.

Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pribe (U.S. Pat. No. 5,802,720). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Pribe shows a shaving cloth having numerous cutters 14. The cutter dimensions are generally less than 0.25 inch, with a preferred size of 0.125 inch in length. (See Pribe at col. 4, lines 26-29).

The claimed invention, on the other hand, is directed to a hair removal device comprising microblades. As defined in the specification of the present invention, a microblade includes a cutting edge having a radius of curvature not greater than about 1000 angstroms, preferably not greater than 500 angstroms, more preferably

not greater than about 250 angstroms, still more preferably not greater than about 100 angstroms. (See specification at page 10, lines 3-7).

Because one angstrom is defined as one ten-billionth of a meter, a microblade as defined in the present invention includes a cutting edge having a radius of curvature not greater than about one ten-thousands of a millimeter, preferably not greater than one twenty-thousands of a millimeter, more preferably not greater than about one forty-thousands of a millimeter, still more preferably not greater than about one hundred-thousands of a millimeter. The diameters of the above mentioned microblades range from about two ten-thousands of a millimeter to about one five hundred-thousands of a millimeter.

The cutters of Pribe, on the other hand, have dimensions generally less than 0.25 inch (i.e., 6.35 millimeters), with a preferred size of 0.125 inch (i.e., 3.175 millimeters) in length.

Thus, the diameter range of the microblades of the present invention (one five hundred-thousands of a millimeter to two ten thousands of a millimeter) is on the order of 1,587,500 to 31,750 times smaller compared with the range defined in Pribe (3.175 millimeters to 6.35 millimeters). In other words, it cannot be maintained that the cutters of Pribe are microblades as defined and claimed in the present invention.

For an anticipation rejection to be appropriate, each and every limitation in the rejected claim must be disclosed in a single prior art reference used in the claim rejection. Because Pribe does not disclose microblades as defined and claimed in the present invention, it cannot be maintained that claim 64 is anticipated by Pribe.

Claims 65-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Pribe. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 65-69 further limit claim 64 by reciting that the device comprises at least about 50 microblades (claim 65), at least about 100 microblades (claim 66), at

least about 200 microblades (claim 64), at least about 500 microblades (claim 68), and at least about 1000 microblades (claim 69).

Because Pribe does not even remotely teach or suggest microblades as explained hereinabove, it cannot be maintained that Pribe is a sufficient reference to either anticipate, or in the alternative, make obvious the device of the claimed invention regardless of the number of microblades being claimed. Accordingly, claims 65-69 are not anticipated by or obvious in view of Pribe.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 64-69 and 85-87 are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed herein, an early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

No fees or deficiencies in fees are believed to be owed. However authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 13-0235 in the event any such fees are owed.

Respectfully submitted,

By Daniel G. Mackas
Daniel G. Mackas
Registration No. 38,541
Attorney for Applicants

McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP
CityPlace II
185 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3402

Marked-up Version of Amendments

A marked-up version of the amendments is set forth below showing additions with underlining and deletions between brackets.

In the Abstract of the Disclosure

Hair removal devices comprising a plurality of micro-blades [and methods for their fabrication, include, for example, microelectronic manufacturing techniques.

Preferred "blades" have] include blades having at least one edge with a radius of curvature not greater than about 1000 angstroms, preferably not greater than about 500 angstroms. Alternative embodiments [of the present invention] comprise a relatively high number of abrasion elements for hair removal. In addition to blades and/or abrasion elements, shaving devices [of this invention] can comprise skin flow control elements which control the flow of hair across the shaving device and thereby control the angle at which the blade edges or abrasion elements contact the hair. The shaving devices may comprise one or more blades having a cutting depth of not greater than about 75 microns. The shaving devices are formed on rigid or flexible substrates using one or more of the following techniques: photolithography, wet chemical etching, dry etching, or material deposition techniques.

[Another aspect of the present invention comprises blades having cutting depth which are much smaller than previously known shaving devices. For example, the cutting depth of one or more blades is not greater than about 75 microns, or is even less.

Shaving devices are formed on rigid or flexible substrates using one or more of the following techniques: photolithography, wet chemical etching, dry etching, or material deposition techniques.